



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

XENOPHON *Anabasis* i. 8. 13

Professor Charles Knapp, in the *Classical Journal* for November, 1916 (XII, 146 ff.), criticizes the common explanation of the participles *ὄρων* and *ἀκούων* in Xenophon's *Anabasis* i. 8. 13. The passage is as follows: *ὄρων δὲ ὁ Κλέαρχος τὸ μέσον στῖφος καὶ ἀκούων Κύρου ξέω ὄντα τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ εὐωνύμου βασιλέα (τοσοῦτον γὰρ πλήθει περιῆν βασιλεὺς ὥστε μέσον τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἔχων τοῦ Κύρου εὐωνύμου ξέω ἦν), ἀλλ' ὁμως ὁ Κλέαρχος οὐκ ἤθελεν ἀποσπᾶσαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τὸ δεξιὸν κέρασ, φοβούμενος μὴ κυκλωθῇ ἐκατέρωθεν.* This has generally been assumed to mean: "But though Clearchus saw the crowded mass at the center [that is, the king's bodyguard of six thousand cavalry] and though he heard from Cyrus that the king was beyond the Greek left (for the king was so much superior in numbers that, though he commanded the center of his own troops, he was beyond Cyrus's left), yet, in spite of all this, Clearchus was not willing to draw his right wing away from the river, because he feared that he might be surrounded on both sides."

Professor Knapp asserts that this interpretation of *ὄρων* and *ἀκούων* as concessive (adversative) is palpably false. He takes the participles to be causal, like *φοβούμενος*. A paraphrase of the sentence would then run somewhat as follows: "But because Clearchus knew, from what he saw and heard, that the king was beyond the Greek left, and therefore at a considerable distance from the river, he was not willing to go against him, as his right wing would thereby be drawn away from the river and he would be in danger of being surrounded on both sides." This gives good sense, but it takes no account of *ὁμως*.

To what, then, is *ὁμως* opposed? Professor Knapp finds no difficulty in considering it as opposed to the idea contained in *ἔχων*, holding that the sentence *τοσοῦτον . . . ἦν* is only quasi-parenthetical and would best be set off by commas only, instead of by dashes or parentheses, which most editors adopt. He admits, however, that this use of *ὁμως* in opposition, not to anything in the proposition in which it stands, but to something in a totally different proposition, is illogical. But he maintains that this lack of logic is a proper cause for thankfulness as showing the sensitiveness of Xenophon, and of the Greeks in general, to the varying shades of meaning of the participle (in this case *ἔχων*).

Now there are undoubtedly illogical passages in Xenophon; but, as Professor G. C. Scoggin remarks in the *Classical Journal* for February, 1917 (XII, 335), the present passage cannot justly be considered as one of them. *ἔχων* is clearly concessive (adversative), but that Xenophon was so far influenced by it, after he had completed the proposition in which it stands, that it led him to begin the next clause with *ἀλλ' ὁμως*, even though this clause is not in the least opposed to the idea contained in *ἔχων*, thus leaving *ὁμως* so meaningless that, as Professor Knapp admits, it must be neglected in translation—all this seems to me very unlikely.

Professor John M. Bridgham's suggestion, also in the February, 1917, number of the *Classical Journal* (XII, 334 f.), that the participles are causal and $\delta\mu\omega\varsigma$ is adversative to $\epsilon\beta\acute{o}\alpha$ in the previous sentence and should be translated "after all," seems equally improbable.

But if we go back to the previous sentence, we shall gain a better idea of what was, as it seems to me, in Xenophon's mind when he was writing these lines. We may then paraphrase the whole passage in this wise: "Hereupon Cyrus himself came riding by with his interpreter and three or four other men, and he called out to Clearchus to lead his army against the enemy's center because it was there that the king was stationed. 'And if we are victorious at this point,' said he, 'our whole task has been accomplished.' But though Clearchus, both from what he saw and from what he had heard from Cyrus, knew where the king was [and realized that Cyrus had given a reasonable order], yet, in spite of all this, he disobeyed because he was unwilling to lead his right wing away from the river, fearing that he might be surrounded on both sides; but he allowed Cyrus to believe that he would carry out the order, replying that he was taking care that all should go well."

The bracketed words are not in the Greek, and they are not essential, but it is not difficult to suppose that the idea expressed by them was in Xenophon's subconsciousness, for he showed himself a good tactician on the retreat and in all probability realized the costliness of Clearchus' disobedience, which, as Plutarch says (*Life of Artaxerxes*, 8), "ruined everything." His avoidance of open criticism of Clearchus, however, may be due partly to loyalty to his former commander and partly to unwillingness to blame a course of action which was in keeping with the well-known principle of Greek tactics not to expose the right, or unshielded, side to the enemy.

It seems to me, then, that the many editors, in America, England, France, Germany, and doubtless elsewhere, who have taken the participles $\acute{o}\rho\acute{o}\nu$ and $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{o}\upsilon\omega\nu$ as concessive (adversative), with $\delta\mu\omega\varsigma$ opposed to them, are fully justified in their interpretation, and that this explanation is much easier and more natural than the assumption that the participles are causal and that $\delta\mu\omega\varsigma$ is in opposition either to $\epsilon\chi\omega\nu$ or to $\epsilon\beta\acute{o}\alpha$.

MAURICE W. MATHER

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS